

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

LAURA ELERDING,

Appellant,

v.

WASHINGTON STATE LIBRARY,

Respondent.

Case No. ALLO-01-0021

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING  
HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE  
DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

**Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, and GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated June 11, 2001. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Appeals Board in Olympia, Washington, on February 1, 2002.

**Appearances.** Appellant Laura Elerding was present and was represented by George Weirich, Representative for the Washington Public Employees Association. Terry Wilson, Human Resource Coordinator, represented Respondent Washington State Library.

**Background.** Appellant submitted a classification questionnaire (CQ) dated August 8, 2000 requesting that her position as a Senior Library Information Assistant be reallocated to the Library Information Associate classification. Appellant's duty station is located in the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) Library, a branch of the Washington State Library. Mary Lu

1 White, Appellant 's supervisor and Manager of the UTC Library, agreed with the duties described  
2 in Appellant's CQ.

3  
4 The Washington State Library's (WSL) Office of Human Resources received Appellant 's CQ on  
5 August 14, 2000. On August 25, 2000, Terry L. Wilson, Human Resource Coordinator, met with  
6 Appellant to discuss the duties listed in the CQ. Ms. Wilson believed that Appellant's CQ differed  
7 significantly from a CQ that Ms. Wilson used in May 2000 to conduct a desk audit of Appellant's  
8 position for a prior allocation request made by Appellant. Ms. Wilson subsequently directed  
9 Appellant to document her daily work activities in a log beginning September 2000.

10  
11 On December 21, 2000, Janice Walsh, Assistant Director for WSL, signed Appellant's CQ,  
12 indicating that she disagreed with Appellant's statement of her duties. In an attached letter dated  
13 December 18, 2000, Ms. Walsh wrote, "Because I don't have enough information about your  
14 duties, I cannot agree that the position should be upgraded."

15  
16 By letter dated December 26, 2000, Ms. Wilson informed Appellant that the agency was reaffirming  
17 its prior determination that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Senior Library  
18 Information Assistant classification. Ms. Wilson also cited Appellant's failure to submit the daily  
19 work logs as the reason for this determination.

20  
21 In January 2001, Appellant began to document her work tasks.

22  
23 On January 19, 2001, revisions to the Library Information Associate class specification went into  
24 effect. The revisions eliminated the distinguishing characteristics and modified the definition and  
25 minimum qualifications of the classification.

1 In February 2001, Ms. Walsh reviewed Appellant's log of daily activities and concluded that the  
2 majority of Appellant's tasks were not at the Library Information Associate level. By letter dated  
3 February 22, 2001, Ms. Walsh notified Appellant that her position was properly allocated.  
4 Appellant appealed this determination the Department of Personnel. On May 21, 2001, Paul  
5 Peterson, Personnel Hearings Officer, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated  
6 June 11, 2001, Mr. Peterson informed Appellant that her position was properly allocated to the  
7 SLIA classification. In his letter, Mr. Peterson indicated that he utilized the revised SLIA  
8 specification, which went into effect as of January 19, 2001, to make his determination. On July 11,  
9 2001, Appellant filed exceptions to Mr. Peterson's allocation determination.  
10

11  
12 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that Mr. Peterson erred when he failed to  
13 examine the duties and responsibilities of her position in association with the specification of the  
14 Library Information Associate which was in effect at the time that her CQ was submitted in August  
15 2000. Appellant asserts that Mr. Peterson instead relied on the specification that was revised and in  
16 effect on January 19, 2001. Appellant argues that Mr. Peterson should have reviewed her duties  
17 and responsibilities and compared them to the specification in effect prior to the January 2001  
18 revisions. Appellant argues that Mr. Peterson further erred when he did not allow her to discuss  
19 specific tasks she performed and when he relied upon an organization chart to support his decision  
20 that she was properly allocated to the SLIA position. Appellant asserts that the duties and  
21 responsibilities she performed are at the Library Information Associate level and that her position  
22 should be reallocated.  
23

24  
25 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent asserts that in May 2000, it performed a desk  
26 audit of Appellant's position and duties and that the results of the audit did not support reallocation

1 to a higher-level position. Respondent asserts that Appellant did not appeal that determination, but  
2 rather completed a new CQ in August 2000 that differed significantly from the CQ used during the  
3 desk audit. Respondent asserts that after a subsequent review of Appellant's duties, which included  
4 a review of the work logs provided by Appellant, Ms. Walsh and two other librarians could not  
5 conclude that Appellant spent over 50 percent of her time performing duties at the Library  
6 Information Associate level. Respondent argues that Appellant is properly allocated to the Senior  
7 Library Information Assistant classification.

8  
9 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated  
10 to the Senior Library Information Assistant classification should be affirmed.  
11

12  
13 **Relevant Classifications.** Senior Library Information Assistant, class code 25060 and Library  
14 Information Associate, class code 25100 (revisions effective July 1, 1999 and January 19, 2001).  
15

16 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
17 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
18 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
19 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
20 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
21 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
22 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
23 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).  
24  
25  
26

1 Position allocations are “based upon an investigation of duties and responsibilities assigned and/or  
2 performed and other information and recommendations.” (WAC 356-20-200).

3  
4 Because a current and accurate description of a position’s duties and responsibilities is documented  
5 in an approved classification questionnaire, the classification questionnaire becomes the basis for  
6 allocation of a position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and  
7 responsibilities, as documented in the CQ. Lawrence v. Dept of Social and Health Services, PAB  
8 No. ALLO-99-0027 (2000).

9  
10 Appellant proved that the director’s designee failed to consider the Library Information Associate  
11 specification that was in effect at the time that she requested a review of her position. In addition,  
12 Appellant established that the designee erred by relying on work logs documenting the duties and  
13 responsibilities she performed subsequent to her filing her classification questionnaire. In  
14 determining the proper allocation of Appellant’s position, the director’s designee should have  
15 considered the duties and responsibilities assigned to and/or performed by Appellant in comparison  
16 to the classification specification that existed at the time of her request for review.  
17

18  
19 **Conclusion.** This matter should be remanded to the Director of the Department of Personnel for a  
20 review of Appellant’s duties and responsibilities as they existed on August 14, 2000. The  
21 Director’s designee should compare Appellant’s duties and responsibilities to the classification  
22 specification that was in effect at that time and determine whether on August 14, 2000, Appellant’s  
23 position was properly allocated.  
24

25  
26 **ORDER**

Personnel Appeals Board  
2828 Capitol Boulevard  
Olympia, Washington 98504

1 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Laura Elerding is remanded to  
2 the Director of the Department of Personnel to conduct a position review and determine whether on  
3 August 14, 2000 Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Senior Library Information  
4 Assistant classification.

5  
6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the designee's review will include the Library Information  
7 Associate specification in effect on August 14, 2000 and the duties and responsibilities Appellant  
8 was performing at that time.

9  
10 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2002.

11  
12 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

13  
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

15  
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair